REMARKS

Claims 1-6, 10, 11, 14-19, 23, 24, 27-32, 36, 37, 40-46,* 48, 49, and 51 are pending in this application.

Claims 1-6, 10, 11, 14-19, 23, 24, 27-32, 36, 37, and 40-45 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Emens et al. U.S. Patent No. 6,591,279 ("Emens"), in view of Serbinis et al. U.S. Patent No. 6,584,466 ("Serbinis"), in further view of Davis et al. U.S. Patent No. 7,010,144 ("Davis"), in still further view of Amini et al. U.S. Patent No. 6,698,021 ("Amini").

Claims 46-49 and 51 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Emens in view of Serbinis, in further view of Major et al. U.S. Patent No. 7,209,955 ("Major"), in still further view of Davis and Amini.

Applicants have amended independent claims 1, 14, 27, 40, and 46 to more particularly define the invention. No new matter has been added and the amendments are fully supported by the original specification.

The Examiner's rejections are respectfully traversed.

The Rejection of Independent Claims 1, 14, and 27

The Examiner has rejected independent claims 1, 14, and 27 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Emens in view of Serbinis in further view of Davis in still further view of Amini.

Applicants' amended independent claims 1, 14, and 27 are, generally speaking, directed to a method and systems for

* The Office Action incorrectly states that claims 39-45 are pending. In fact claim 39 was previously canceled and claim 46 remains pending.

providing remote access to a capture device and content captured by the capture device. The capture device is automatically registered with a remote computer over a communications network, where the automatic registration associates the capture device with user information. Content regarding an event (e.g., detected by a sensor) is captured by the capture device and automatically encapsulated with metadata that includes information about the capture device, the content, the event, and the user information. The content encapsulated with metadata is automatically transmitted to the remote computer over the communications network, where the metadata encapsulating the content is processed according the information included in the metadata. The processing includes automatically associating the content with a user account, publishing the content to a database on the remote computer, generating a textual notification at the remote computer that includes information about the event, and transmitting the textual notification from the remote computer to a user associated with the account. The user may access the published content and current status information for the capture device – including data regarding a state of the capture device – using a user access device, and the user may send a command from the user access device to the capture device via the remote computer in order to change the state of the capture device.

The claimed approach recites a highly desirable technique for providing a user with remote access to content captured by a device, whereby user intervention in the configuration of the capture device and subsequent processing of the captured content is minimized. For example, the claimed approach enables a user to introduce a capture device into a

network environment, where it is automatically registered and associated with user information (e.g., by a monitoring device connected to the capture device). Content captured by the device is then automatically encapsulated with metadata including the user information associated with the device, thus producing a self-contained data packet that can be processed at a remote computer to recover the user information. Once the user information is recovered, the content can be automatically associated with a user account and, in turn, the content can be published and a notification sent to the appropriate user. In sum, a user need only connect a device, in "plug-and-play" fashion, in order to begin receiving notifications and to enable remote access of captured content; the process whereby the device is registered and associated with user information, and the captured content is published on a remote computer according to a properly identified user account, is performed automatically.

Applicants respectfully submit that the combination of Emens, Serbinis, Davis, and Amini does not show or suggest all of the elements of applicants' amended independent claims. In particular, the combination of these references does not show or suggest the claimed features of "automatically registering a capture device with a remote computer over a communications network, wherein the automatic registration associates the capture device with user information," "automatically encapsulating [locally captured] content with metadata, wherein the metadata includes information about [...] the user information," and, at the remote computer, "automatically associating the content with a user account according to the user information included with the metadata."

I. The Emens Reference

Emens refers to a computer-based notification system. A user may define event notification profiles specifying sensor conditions and actions to be performed upon satisfaction of the sensor conditions. The notification profiles are transmitted to a server where the profiles are stored for use in a profile matching function. In particular, when the server receives input from a sensor, the server matches the input against the specified sensor conditions of one or more notification profiles and executes actions specified in those notification profiles containing sensor conditions satisfied by the sensor input. The specified actions may include sending a notification to the user, including a digital image of the event. *See* Emens, *e.g.*, col. 2, ll. 59-65. When digital images are included, mappings between cameras and digital images are defined in the notification profiles and must be manually configured. *See* Emens, *e.g.*, col. 5, ll. 19-24.

II. The Serbinis Reference

Serbinis refers to an Internet-based document management system. An electronic document may be stored on an Internet-accessible server and accessed using a web browser, downloaded for review or manipulation, and then returned to the server for access by other users. The document management system may send authorized users notifications related to the documents stored on the server. *See* Serbinis, *e.g.*, col. 18, ll. 31-42. Before notifications can be sent, however, authorized users must be manually designated for each document shared. *See* Serbinis, *e.g.*, col. 11, ll. 21-34.

III. The Davis Reference

Davis refers to a steganographic embedder that associates metadata with an image. The metadata associated with the image must be manually specified by a user through the user interface of an image capture device or through the user interface of an external device. *See* Davis, *e.g.*, col. 3, ll. 6-9.

IV. The Amini Reference

Amini refers to a real-time off-site video image storage system. Video images are captured at client sites and forwarded to an off-site server. At the off-site server, the video images are produced for live viewing or archiving. A user can retrieve the live or archived video images through a client work station, and the user may additionally issue camera control commands to alter the pan-tilt-zoom (PTZ) position of the camera producing the live images. *See* Amini, *e.g.*, col. 3, ll. 29-49.

V. Emens Does Not Show or Suggest Automatically Registering a Capture Device with a Remote Computer

Applicants respectfully submit that there is nothing in Emens that shows or suggests the claimed automatic registration feature. Specifically, there is no discussion in Emens regarding any kind of automatic device registration with a remote computer. Instead, in Emens, a user must manually define a notification profile that includes (a) all necessary information about the device (e.g., mappings between cameras and the digital images produced therefrom), (b) sensor conditions associated with the device for use in triggering actions, and (c) the actions to perform when the sensor conditions are met. Moreover, Emens does not show or suggest associating a capture

device with user information, as recited in applicants' independent claims. At best, Emens may determine user information at the proxy server where incoming sensor data is compared to the stored notification profiles. *See* Emens, *e.g.*, col. 6, ll. 26-40. However, even then, Emens does not show or suggest associating user information with a specific device. Rather, the functionality of Emens' notification system is entirely dependent on notification profiles, which are manually defined by users and therefore preclude Emens' system from achieving the autonomous capabilities of the claimed approach.

Similarly, there is nothing in Serbinis, Davis, or Amini that makes up for these deficiencies in Emens. Specifically, neither Serbinis, nor Davis, nor Amini shows or suggests the claimed automatic device registration feature, which includes associating a capture device with user information.

VI. The Combination of Emens and Serbinis

Applicants respectfully disagree with the Examiner's contention that Emens can be combined with Serbinis to show the claimed feature of "automatically transmitting [a] generated textual notification from the remote computer to a user associated with the user account." As discussed above, the claimed approach refers to an automated process whereby metadata-encapsulated content is processed in order to automatically associate the content with a user account. In other words, a determination of a user account is made - automatically - based on the received metadata. The claimed notification feature is thus able to automatically transmit notifications to a recipient based on the user information

received within the metadata. In contrast, in Serbinis, before the document management system may send authorized users notifications, authorized users must be manually designated for each document shared. *See* Serbinis, *e.g.*, col. 11, ll. 21-34. Requiring manual entry of authorized notification recipients stands in contradistinction to the claimed feature of automatically determining a recipient of the notification from the received metadata.

VII. The Combination of Emens and Davis

Applicants also respectfully disagree with the Examiner's contention that Emens can be combined with Davis to show the claimed feature of "automatically encapsulating the content with metadata, wherein the metadata includes information about the capture device, the content, the event, and the user information." The Examiner appears to cite Davis simply to show the concept of metadata being associated with an image. However, applicants respectfully submit that the claimed feature of automatically encapsulating captured content is much more than mere addition of metadata. Rather, the claimed approach provides an advantageous method of employing metadata for a desirable purpose. Specifically, metadata is used for the purpose of automating the identification of captured content and associating the content with a user account. In Davis, on the other hand, metadata associated with an image must be manually specified by a user through the user interface of an image capture device or through the user interface of an external device. *See* Davis, *e.g.*, col. 3, ll. 6-9. Thus, like Emens and Serbinis, Davis requires manual user intervention, while the

claimed approach provides an automated, seamless user experience.

For at least these reasons, applicants submit that the rejection of amended independent claims 1, 14, and 27 should be withdrawn.

The Rejection of Independent Claims 40 and 46

The Examiner rejected independent claim 40 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Emens in view of Serbinis in further view of Davis and Amini. The Examiner rejected independent claim 46 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Emens in view of Serbinis, in further view of Major, in still further view of Davis and Amini.

Applicants submit that the rejections of amended independent claims 40 and 46 should be withdrawn for at least the reasons recited above with respect to amended independent claims 1, 14, and 27.

The Rejection of the Dependent Claims

Applicants submit that the dependent claims 2-6, 10, 11, 15-19, 23, 24, 28-32, 36, 37, 41-45, 48, 49, and 51 are allowable at least because they depend, directly or indirectly from independent claims 1, 14, 27, 40, and 46, respectively.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, applicants submit that this application, including claims 1-6, 10, 11, 14-19, 23, 24, 27-32, 36, 37, 40-46, 48, 49, and 51, is now in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and allowance of this application are respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

/Michael J. Chasan/

Michael J. Chasan
Registration No. 54,026
Agent for Applicants
ROPES & GRAY LLP
Customer No. 1473
Tel.: (212) 596-9000